

REMARKS

I. Status of the Application

By the present amendment, Applicant amends claims 1, 3-4 and 6. Claims 1-7 are all the claims pending in the application. Claims 1-7 have been rejected.

The present Amendment addresses each point of objection and rejection raised by the Examiner. Favorable reconsideration is respectfully requested.

II. Claim Rejections Under 35 U.S.C. § 102

The Examiner has rejected claims 1, 2 and 4-5 as allegedly being anticipated by U.S. Patent No. 6,861,805 to Jackson et al. (hereinafter “Jackson”). Applicant respectfully traverses these rejections for *at least* the reasons set forth below.

A. Independent Claim 1

The Examiner alleges that Jackson discloses each and every element of claim 1. Applicant respectfully disagrees.

Independent claim 1 recites (among other things):

...wherein the light emitting tube comprises translucent ceramics formed substantially cylindrically and has a ratio d/L of an outside diameter d to a whole length L ranging from 0.2 to 0.5...

Jackson does not disclose that the arc tube 20 has a radio d/L of an outside diameter d to a whole length L ranging from 0.2 to 0.5, as claimed. To the contrary, Jackson merely discloses that the inside diameter of the arc tube 20 can range from 26 mm to 45 mm and that the wall thickness of the arc tube 20 can range from 0.8 mm to 1.5 mm. *See e.g.*, Table 1. Jackson also

discloses that the inside length of the discharge space 21 can range from 26 mm to 45 mm. *See e.g.*, Table 1.

Importantly, Jackson does not disclose the whole length of the arc tube 20, since the length of the extended plugs 26 and 27 is not specified. As such, Jackson does not provide any disclosure or suggestion that the dimensions of the arc tube 20 fall within the range recited in claim 1. Therefore, Jackson fails to disclose or suggest that the arc tube 20 has a ratio d/L of an outside diameter d to a whole length L ranging from 0.2 to 0.5, as claimed.

Independent claim 1 further recites:

...wherein said both ends of the light emitting tube are sealed by a molybdenum layer, which bonds the light emitting tube to molybdenum pipes in which the electrodes are fixed and held respectively...

Additionally, Applicant submits that Jackson fails to disclose or suggest the above feature. Indeed, Jackson does not provide any suggestion whatsoever that both ends of the arc tube 20 are sealed by molybdenum pipes and a molybdenum bonding layer, as claimed. As described in the present specification, for instance, the reference numeral 14a denotes a molybdenum metallized layer bonding the light emitting tube 12 to the molybdenum pipe 14. Paragraph 0047 and Figure 13.

In contrast to the requirements of claim 1, Jackson teaches that the electrodes 30 and 40 each have a lead-in 32 and 42 of niobium which is sealed with a frit 33 and 43, which hermetically seals the electrode assembly into the PCA arc tube. Column 4, lines 37-50.

Therefore, Applicant submits that claim 1 is not anticipated by Jackson for *at least* these independent reasons. Further, Applicant submits that claim 2 is patentable over Jackson *at least* by virtue of its dependency on claim 1. As such, Applicant respectfully requests that the Examiner withdraw these rejections.

B. Independent Claim 4

In view of the similarity between the requirements of claim 4 and the requirements discussed above with respect to independent claim 1, Applicant respectfully submits that arguments analogous to the foregoing arguments as to the patentability of independent claim 1 demonstrate the patentability of claim 4. As such, it is respectfully submitted that claim 4 is patentably distinguishable over the cited Jackson reference *at least* for reasons analogous to those presented above. Further, Applicant submits that the dependent claim 5 is allowable *at least* by virtue of its dependency on claim 4. Thus, the allowance of these claims is respectfully solicited of the Examiner.

III. Claim Rejections Under 35 U.S.C. § 103

The Examiner has rejected claim 7 as allegedly being unpatentable over Jackson. Claim 7 incorporates all the novel and non-obvious limitations of its base claim 1. Applicant respectfully traverses this rejection.

For *at least* the reasons already discussed above, Jackson fails to disclose or suggest all the limitations of claim 1. Therefore, Applicant submits that claim 7 is patentable over the cited Jackson reference *at least* by virtue of its dependency on claim 1 and respectfully requests that the Examiner withdraw this rejection.

The Examiner has also rejected claims 3 and 6 as allegedly being unpatentable over Jackson in view of EP 0859246 to Uchiyama (hereinafter “Uchiyama”). Applicant respectfully traverses these rejections.

In view of the similarity between the requirements of claims 3 and 6 and the requirements discussed above with respect to independent claim 1, Applicant respectfully submits that arguments analogous to the foregoing arguments as to the patentability of independent claim 1 demonstrate the patentability of claims 3 and 6. As such, it is respectfully submitted that claims 3 and 6 are patentably distinguishable over the cited Jackson reference *at least* for reasons analogous to those presented above. Moreover, Uchiyama fails to remedy the deficient teachings of Jackson. Thus, the allowance of these claims is respectfully solicited of the Examiner.

IV. Conclusion

In view of the above, reconsideration and allowance of this application are now believed to be in order, and such actions are hereby solicited. If any points remain in issue which the Examiner feels may be best resolved through a personal or telephone interview, the Examiner is kindly requested to contact the undersigned at the telephone number listed below.

AMENDMENT UNDER 37 C.F.R. § 1.116
U.S. SERIAL NO.: 10/656,336

Atty. Docket No. Q77365

The USPTO is directed and authorized to charge all required fees, except for the Issue Fee and the Publication Fee, to Deposit Account No. 19-4880. Please also credit any overpayments to said Deposit Account.

Respectfully submitted,

Andrew J. Taska
Andrew J. Taska
Registration No. 54,666

SUGHRUE MION, PLLC
Telephone: (202) 293-7060
Facsimile: (202) 293-7860

WASHINGTON OFFICE
65565
CUSTOMER NUMBER

Date: May 2, 2007